

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ı	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	09/750,417	12/27/2000	Stuart J. Clenaghan	6311-005	6939
	21890 7590 02/12/2007 PROSKAUER ROSE LLP			EXAMINER	
	PATENT DEP	ARTMENT		HAMILTON, LALITA M	
1585 BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10036-8299				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3691	
•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			<u> </u>
	SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
•	3 MC	NTHS	02/12/2007	PAP	PER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	09/750,417	CLENAGHAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Lalita M. Hamilton	3691				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status	•	•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 No	ovember 2006.	•				
· <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Diamonitism of Claims		•				
Disposition of Claims	•					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>20 and 38-46</u> is/are pending in the app	•	•				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>20 and 38</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
<u> </u>						
•	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>39-46</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	I	•				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
, Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
· —	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	have been received					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 						
						application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) A) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/750,417

Art Unit: 3691

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

On October 23, 2006, a restriction requirement was sent to the Applicant. On November 21, 2006, the Applicant responded by electing group II, claims 39-46 without traverse.

Election/Restrictions

The Applicant has elected group II, claims 39-46 without traverse. Claims 20 and 38 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupien (6,012,046) in view of Kohls (7,020,632)

Application/Control Number: 09/750,417

Art Unit: 3691

Lupien discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth in the previous Office Action; however, Lupien does not disclose allocating the debt instrument in the time stamp order. Kohls teaches a method and corresponding system for trading contracts comprising allocation based on time-stamp order (col.4, lines 38-45). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate allocation based on time-stamp order as taught by Kohls into the invention disclosed by Lupien, to provide a means of ordering the components.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 39-46 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lalita M. Hamilton whose telephone number is (571) 272-6743. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday (6:30-2:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kalinowski Alexander can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/750,417

Art Unit: 3691

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lalita M. Hamilton

Primary Examiner, 3691